

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS****1. Request for Continued Examination:**

The applicant respectfully requests continued examination of the above-indicated application as per 37 CFR 1.114.

5

The amendments made to the claims in the above section are over the last entered amendment filed January 21, 2005.

**2. Rejection of claims 1-7 and 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):**

10 Claims 1-7 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lebby taken with Yang in view of Yamazaki et al., all of record.

**Response:**

15 Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Claim 1 now contains the limitation stating that the first reaction layer and the second reaction layer are held together by an organic transparent adhesive layer. This limitation is supported in the specification and in the original claim 9. Claim 9 recites that the organic transparent adhesive layer comprises at least one material selected from the group consisting of PI, BCB, and PFCB. Each of these three materials is an organic material, and therefore  
20 the transparent adhesive layer is organic as well. No new matter is added through this amendment.

On the other hand, none of the cited prior art references teaches using an organic transparent adhesive layer. Although Yamazaki (US 2001/0019244) teaches in  
25 paragraph 0068 using Ti and Cr in reaction layers for promoting adhesion, Yamazaki merely teaches using Ti and Cr to enhance adhesive between a substrate and an ITO film, which is a transparent conductive layer. The material characteristics of ITO are different from that of PI, BCB, and PFCB. ITO is a conductive material, but PI, BCB, and PFCB are not. Additionally, PI, BCB, and PFCB are organic materials,


while ITO is not. Thus, none of the cited prior art teach using an organic transparent adhesive layer to hold together a first reaction layer and a second reaction layer.

5       For these reasons, the currently amended claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited prior art. Claims 9 and 12 are also amended to recite that the transparent adhesive layer is organic. Claims 2-7 and 9-13 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-7 and 9-13 is therefore respectfully requested.

10       In light of the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

15



Date: July 6, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

20       Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.

25